```
.UP 10 2; Draft, printer 1; -n -PA4 -y -dFX-NORMAL -Fx -e; dumbp
.............L........T.......T.......T.......T.......T.......R
.UP 10 2; Draft, printer 1; -n -PA4 -y -dFX-NORMAL -Fx -e; dumbp
.............L........T.......T.......T.......T.......T.......R
.UP 10 2; Draft, printer 1; -n -PA4 -y -dFX-NORMAL -Fx -e; dumbp
.............L........T.......T.......T.......T.......T.......R
.UP 10 2; Draft, local-1; -n -PA4 -dFX-NORMAL -y -e; dumbp
L......T.......T.......T.......T.......T.......T.......T.......T....R
.............L........T.......T.......T.......T.......T.......R
.PL55
.SP2
```

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION NO.133 OF 2005

Renuka Road Lines ..Petitioner.
Vs.
The New India Assurance Co.Ltd.
& anr. ..Respondents.
...
Mr.A.M.Kulkarni for the Petitioner.

CORAM : DR.D.Y.CHANDRACHUD, J. @@
AAAAAAA AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA AAA
29th November 2005.

P.C. :@@

```
CCCC
.............L.......I.......T.......T.......T.......T.......T.J
```

The learned Trial Judge is correct in holding that the withdrawal of the earlier consumer complaint will not preclude the insurance company from filing a suit for recovery. In the purshis for withdrawal, the insurance company had specifically stated that it was seeking leave to withdraw the consumer complaint since it wished to file a suit. The order permitting withdrawal specifically records that it is in view of the withdrawal purshis. In this view of the matter, no interference is warranted. The Civil Revision Application is dismissed.